

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, DC

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON  
JANUARY 17, 1992, IN LISNER HALL  
ROOM 603

The meeting was called to order by President Trachtenberg at 2:17 p.m.

Present: President Trachtenberg, Vice President French, Registrar Gaglione, Parliamentarian Schechter, Belknap, Burdetsky, Carson, Divita, East, Garris, Gilmore, Griffith, Gupta, Harrington, Hill, Holmes, Keimowitz, Mahmood, Park, Parke, D. Robinson, L. Robinson, Schiff, Silber, S. Smith, Smythe, Vontress, and Wirtz

Absent: Felts, Friedenthal, Giordano, Kenny, Maddox, Miller, Morgan, Pock, and P. Smith

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of December 13, 1991, were approved as distributed.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION 91/6, "A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE TO ESTABLISH SCHOOL-WIDE PERSONNEL COMMITTEES"

Professor Hill, Chair, Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies, moved the introduction of a substitute resolution which included modifications approved by the ASPP Committee at its January 13, 1992, meeting. The motion was seconded, and copies of the substitute resolution were distributed to the Senate members. No objections were made to consideration of the substitute, and the Chair ruled the substitute resolution was accepted for consideration in place of the original resolution 91/6. Professor Hill then explained the changes reflected in the substitute resolution. He said that the ASPP Committee approved deletion of certain language in the original resolution in order to make the language unambiguous. Professor Hill urged adoption of the substitute resolution.

Professor Wirtz said that the faculty of the School of Business and Public Management met sometime ago to consider the original resolution, and were opposed to it. Having just received the substitute resolution today, Professor Wirtz thought that this matter should be deferred until the SBPM faculty have an opportunity to consider it. He then moved that further

consideration of Substitute Resolution 91/6 be postponed to the February 14th meeting of the Senate, and the motion was seconded.

Professor Griffith pointed out that the present session of the Senate ends with the April 10th meeting. While he understood the sentiment of SBPM for postponement of the substitute resolution, he advised the Senate of a large number of other items scheduled to be placed on the Senate agenda's before the completion of this session. Professor Silber spoke in favor of the motion to postpone because he thought this resolution was a matter of great importance, and the Senate should not be rushed to consider it today.

The question was called on the motion to postpone Substitute Resolution 91/6 to the February 14th Senate meeting, and the motion was approved, 11 to 9. (Substitute Resolution 91/6 is attached.)

#### INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

#### GENERAL BUSINESS

##### I. NOMINATION FOR ELECTION TO SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Griffith moved the following nominations: Chris Filstrup, Assistant University Librarian for Collections, to the Research Committee, as a replacement for Debbie Masters; and Professor Robert G. Brown (Sociology) to the Athletics and Recreation Committee. The nominees were approved unanimously.

##### II. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Griffith reported on the following items:

(1) The Faculty Assembly has been postponed to February 12, 1992, at 2:00-5:00 p.m. After the business of the Assembly is completed, an information session will follow on the matter of "cashability" of TIAA/CREF funds. One item of business on the Assembly agenda is Resolution FA 92/1 to amend the Faculty Organization Plan, as recommended by the Faculty Senate, to conform with the merger of the College and Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Another item will be a "State of the University" address by the President. With regard to the cashability issue, Vice President Bortz and his staff of the Benefits Review Committee will participate in this discussion, and clarification of the legal impact of cashability is being sought. It is expected that once the cashability issue has been discussed at the Faculty Assembly on February 12th, a resolution

from the ASPP Committee on this matter will come before the Senate on February 14th. Faculty members are asked to inform their constituencies of these events.

(2) The Executive Committee is also tentatively planning a second information session in March on retirement plans and health care options. A linkage probably will be proposed between the University's contribution to the health care options and the pension plans.

(3) The Coates/Cohen/Garris Report on Academic Productivity and Teaching Loads, together with Task Force Report, will be mailed shortly to Senate members; these reports will be placed on the Senate's agenda for its February 14th meeting.

(4) The Executive Committee will be establishing a subcommittee to study the question of the number of Senate seats and also the question of whether or not the terms of Senate members should be increased from the present two years to three years.

(5) A joint Task Force is being established by Vice President French and the Executive Committee to study the 4-credit course system proposed by the President.

(6) The Executive Committee has reviewed the proposed revision of the Faculty Handbook; some changes will be recommended to the administration.

(7) Several Mission Statements from Senate Standing Committees have been received; those Committees which have not yet submitted their Mission Statements are asked to send them as soon as possible to the Executive Committee.

(8) The Executive Committee nominated Professor Philip W. Wirtz to serve on the Selection Committee on the Trachtenberg Prize for Teaching.

(9) With reference to the Board of Trustees' meeting on January 16th, the Report of the President's Advisory Committee on Recruitment and Retention of Women and Minorities was submitted to the Trustees' Academic Affairs Committee. A Report of the Senate Special Committee on Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity was submitted last year, but delayed until the Advisory Committee's Report was completed. The next step will be to pull together these two reports to try to figure out exactly what steps should be taken in response. The Trustees' Academic Affairs Committee noted its interest in this matter and asked to be briefed as to the direction the University was moving in this regard. The AAC also reviewed the new procedures for Dean Search Committees, and expressed its concern that one school appeared to be lagging behind the other schools in searching for a new dean.

(10) A letter was sent by the Executive Committee to the faculty urging their attendance at the Martin Luther King, Jr., Convocation on January 15th.

(11) The next meeting of the Executive Committee is Wednesday, January 29, 1992, to set the agenda for the February 14th Senate meeting; any items of business for the Senate's agenda should be received by the Executive Committee before January 29th.

Vice President French noted that the full text of the Report of the President's Advisory Committee on Recruitment and Retention of Women and Minorities will be included as an insert in the next issue of BY GEORGE! He indicated that it would be his job to do some comparative readings of the Senate's Report and the Advisory Committee's Report in order to derive from that some instructions to deans and guidance to the faculty on this broad topic.

### III. INTERIM REPORTS OF SENATE COMMITTEE CHAIRS

The following interim reports were made by the Chairs of Senate Standing Committees:

(1) Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty - Professor Murli M. Gupta, Chair. (Interim Report read by Professor Gupta is attached hereto and made a part of these minutes.)

(2) Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies (including Fringe Benefits) - Professor Peter P. Hill, Chair, reported that the ASPP Committee has met at least once every two weeks. There are three major items on the Committee's agenda: (a) Substitute Resolution 91/6 on establishment of school-wide personnel committees, now postponed to the February 14th Senate meeting; (b) the issue of cashability of TIAA/CREF funds; and (c) the matter of joint appointments.

(3) Athletics and Recreation - Professor Stefan O. Schiff, Chair, reported that the Committee has met twice. At the first meeting the Committee reviewed the plans for the construction of a new recreational center and the renovations of the Smith Center. The second meeting was principally an informational one dealing with major agenda items to be presented at the Annual NCAA Convention recently held. The Committee will meet a third time to hear the results of that Convention.

(4) Educational and Admissions Policy/Student Financial Aid - Professor Philip W. Wirtz, Chair. (Interim Report read by Professor Wirtz is attached hereto and made a part of these minutes.)



(5) Faculty Development and Support - Professor David E. Silber, Chair, reported that the Committee has been looking at the matter of child care, an issue that has been reviewed each year by former chairs of this Committee since 1986. He said the Committee will report to the Senate as to why child care probably will not happen. Everyone thinks it is a good idea, but it is one that is very difficult to implement. The Committee has also taken up the question of retirement. In 1994 the law will be changed to allow people to work as long as they choose. Therefore, the issue of disengagement, not only for senior faculty, but also those at the academic level, needs to be addressed. The Committee is developing its mission statement which will be completed by the deadline of January 31st.

(6) Fiscal Planning and Budgeting - Professor Robert T. Smythe, Chair, reported that the Committee has two current agenda items. The first one is the parking fee issue, and the second one is a discussion of the proposed Wellness and Recreation Center.

(7) Honors and Academic Convocations - Professor James H. Maddox, Chair. (No report was made due to Professor Maddox's absence).

(8) Libraries - Professor Robert J. Harrington, Chair. (Interim Report read by Professor Harrington is attached hereto and made a part of these minutes.)

(9) Physical Facilities - Professor David Robinson, Jr., Chair, reported that the Committee met in the fall with Vice President Katz and members of his staff to discuss a variety of issues, such as the Marvin Center renovation and the Wellness and Recreation Center to augment the Smith Center. A number of Committee members expressed their concerns about priorities which ought to be put toward academic facilities. A meeting of the Committee is scheduled for later this month to discuss these matters again, as well as the status of academic needs and the status of the negotiations presently underway between the University and WETA with respect to the possible construction of a new facility for this station on GW's campus. The Committee may have a resolution ready for the March meeting of the Senate.

(10) Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom - Professor William B. Griffith, on behalf of Professor John A. Morgan, Jr., Chair, reported that the Executive Committee has asked the PEAFC Committee to review procedures for faculty recommendations for appointments and reappointments for term contracts. There is considerable concern by faculty who are in non-tenure-accruing status that decisions made with respect to reappointment are often made without any procedural guarantees such as those provided faculty who are in tenure-track positions, and that possibly additional requirements should be stated in the Faculty

Code to assure that non-tenure-accruing faculty are adequately protected.

(11) Research - Professor Robert J. Harrington, Chair. (Interim Report read by Professor Harrington is attached hereto and made a part of these minutes.)

(12) University and Urban Affairs - Professor Dennis H. Holmes, Chair. (Interim Report read by Professor Holmes is attached hereto and made a part of these minutes.)

(13) Joint Committee of Faculty and Students - Professor Stephen C. Smith, Chair. (Interim Report read by Professor Smith is attached hereto and made a part of these minutes.)

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Silber asked about the status of a Senate resolution concerning encouragement for senior faculty disengagement which was adopted by the Senate and forwarded to the administration. Professor Griffith replied that there were two Senate resolutions. The first one proposed a plan that was allegedly revenue-neutral for handling arrangements for senior faculty. That plan was endorsed by the Senate and sent to the President who reported that his cost analysis of it indicated that the particular ratio suggested did not constitute a revenue-neutral plan. The President indicated that the administration was going to continue to experiment with individual buy-out arrangements, but at some point, restructure it and come back to the Senate. The Senate passed a second resolution dealing with the question of early retirement. This resolution asked the schools to make specific arrangements for faculty who were retiring early but who still wished to maintain a strong, academic connection by providing them with improved linkage to the schools. That resolution was forwarded to the administration and returned with the explanation that until we have studied the process of periodic evaluation of continuing faculty, the deans were unwilling to implement the second resolution. A Task Force on Periodic Evaluation of Continuing Faculty has been subsequently established. Professor Griffith said that he did not know whether or not the administration has found a new structure for retirement.

Vice President French commented that the administration continues to discuss with individual faculty arrangements for disengagement. Secondly, he said that the second resolution referred to by Professor Griffith proposed that each school develop an individual plan; however, the administration thought that there should be a uniform plan developed for all schools. Professor Griffith replied that the position of the Senate is that if there is a possibility to propose a plan for supplementing early retirement, that plan should be made public;

however, the President had indicated his preference for dealing with it on an individual basis, rather than being restricted by such a plan.

President Trachtenberg said that he would amend Professor Griffith's statement only by saying that the administration could publish tomorrow the following: "Any faculty member who wants to retire should come to talk to Rod French about it." If we can come to terms, we can work it out. What we are reluctant to do is to have a forum. What we are prepared to say is if it suits faculty members to retire early, and they can persuade their deans and Vice President French that it suits the institutional agenda as well, then we will try to negotiate an arrangement that suits both parties. Vice President Katz pointed out that if the University were to have a standard policy, it would have to create reserves for it immediately, and that would have an enormous financial impact. The President said that presumably the purpose of doing away with mandatory retirement was to provide those few people who wanted to continue working the opportunity to do so. It was not intended, it seemed to him, to give people the opportunity to put their hands in the institution's pocket or to be used as a device to enhance pensions.

Professor Park said it seemed to him that part of the concern of the Senate in having a public forum is not entitlement but the probable response to it. Some faculty might receive one or two years of salary while others might get only parking rights or use of the library. There has to be a sense of evenhandedness in these arrangements because some faculty are not as creative as others are.

Professor Griffith pointed out that there was no new language on early retirement in the proposed revision of the Faculty Handbook, and he suggested that a statement be included. Vice President French responded that such a statement would be added.

Further discussion followed by Professors Silber, Garris, Park, David Robinson, Griffith, President Trachtenberg, and Vice President French.

On a different subject, Professor Griffith said he wished to offer his congratulations to Valerie Epps and her committee for the splendid Martin Luther King, Jr. Convocation, held this past Wednesday, which was broadened to include Native Americans. He also expressed his appreciation to the President and to Vice President Katz for funding this event. Professor Griffith added his congratulations to George W. G. Stoner, Director of Admissions, for recognizing talented students when he sees them and for providing funding, as notably exemplified by the student winner of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Award, Angela Williams.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made and seconded, President Trachtenberg adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "J. Matthew Gaglione". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

J. Matthew Gaglione  
Secretary

A SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION

~~A-RESOLUTION~~ TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE TO ESTABLISH SCHOOL-WIDE PERSONNEL COMMITTEES (91/6)

WHEREAS, all academic units of the University are required by the Faculty Code (Art. IV-B and C) to publish their criteria for the tenure and promotion of regular full-time faculty; and

WHEREAS, school-wide personnel committees have served to assure uniformity in the application of these criteria in those schools where such committees have been established; and

WHEREAS, all faculty have a professional interest in the maintenance of high and uniform standards for tenure and promotion throughout the University; NOW, THEREFORE  
BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

- (1) THAT a new Section D be added to Article IV of the Faculty Code to read:

"D. School-Wide Personnel Committees

To implement the procedures required in Sections B.3 and C.2 above, each school or college shall establish a school-wide personnel committee, either as an elected standing committee or of the school faculty acting as a committee of the whole, to consider recommendations for ~~or against the reappointment,~~ promotion, or tenure of regular full-time faculty. Such committees may request additional information, documentation, or clarification respecting such recommendations. Further:

1. a. An elected standing committee, sitting in review of recommendations originating from a department or equivalent unit, shall advise the dean of that school or college as to whether the candidate has met the relevant school and department criteria, and whether 'compelling reasons' exist for not following the faculty recommendation. Such advisories shall not be construed as 'faculty recommendations' as defined by Sec. B.3. of the Procedures for Implementation of the Faculty Code.

~~b.---Such-elected-standing-committees-may-also review-departmental-criteria-for-reappointment,-promotion,-and-tenure,-and,-as-deemed-appropriate,-recommend that-such-criteria-be-clarified-or-specified-more-fully.~~

2. When the faculty of a school or college, sitting as a committee of the whole, serves as the school's personnel committee, and initiates recommendations to the

(continued)



Substitute Resolution 91/6 (cont'd)

dean for ~~reappointment~~, promotion, or tenure, such recommendations shall be construed as 'faculty recommendations' in the sense of Procedures, Sec. B.3."

- (2) THAT Section D. of Article IV, "Nondiscrimination," be restyled "E. Nondiscrimination."

The foregoing substitute resolution was approved by the  
Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies (on 13 January 1992)

Postponed January 17, 1992, to the next regular meeting of the  
Faculty Senate, February 14, 1992

**Faculty Senate Committee on  
Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty**

**Interim Report**

The Committee reexamined its Mission Statement and affirmed that its mission indeed is to "concern itself with policies and procedures that affect faculty productivity and academic excellence". The Committee felt that the language recommended by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee would dilute the effectiveness of this committee and may leave no faculty oversight on the policies and procedures that affect the faculty.

In the preceding year (1990-91), this Committee initiated a discussion of Post Tenure Faculty Evaluation. As an ad hoc committee is presently studying this issue, we have chosen to not pursue this matter for the time being. There is strong sentiment in the committee that we should continue to be interested in this issue.

Another issue of current interest to the Committee is the issue of Faculty Evaluation of Administrators. There is consensus that all department chairs and program directors should be evaluated by their faculty on a periodic basis; an informal survey of a few chairs indicated that such a review may be found useful by the chairs. There is also interest that such an evaluation should extend to the deans and higher levels of administrators.

There is consensus that the results of any such evaluation should be shared with the administrator being evaluated as a feedback mechanism. Whether the results of any such evaluation should be transmitted to the higher-ups is unclear at this time; it is also not clear if the higher-ups would support such an evaluation process.

Murli M. Gupta  
Chair,  
Faculty Senate Committee on Administrative  
Matters as They Affect the Faculty

January 17, 1992



Faculty Senate Committee on Education and Admissions Policy/  
Student Financial Aid

James Monroe Hall, Room 203  
2115 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20052

Telephone: (202) 994-6369  
Fax: (202) 994-4930

January 17, 1992

1991-92 Interim Report

The Committee met three times to consider the matters outlined below:

1. Proposed Committee Restructuring. The Senate Executive Committee has recommended reorganization of jurisdiction to place together responsibility for policies on admissions with policies on financial aid to align them with administrative integration of these areas. At the request of the Executive Committee, the EAP/SFA Committee reviewed and endorsed the proposed mission statements of the resulting two committees.
2. Graduate +/- Grading System. The Committee reviewed and discussed a working paper on +/- grading for graduate students. Because the Banner system is expected in the near future to provide greater local autonomy with respect to +/- grading than is currently the case, it was agreed that this issue should be deferred to that time.
3. Financial Aid Availability to Upper-classmen. The Committee was requested to explore policy implications associated with a reduction in financial aid to an upperclassman. The issue was resolved to the satisfaction of all parties involved.
4. Student Financial Aid. In response to concerns regarding student financial aid policy (and faculty participation therein), Vice President Chernak, Enrollment Management officials Pallet, Siegel, and Beil, Admissions Director Stoner, and Student Financial Assistance Director Baker provided the Committee with profiles of new students and a variety of data related to admissions and financial aid policy. This issue has been the primary focus of the Committee's attention this year; having been briefed by Administration officials just four days ago, the Committee will reconvene shortly to review its position on this important matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert M. Dunn, Jr.  
Kevin Glover  
Joseph A. Greenberg  
Rachelle S. Heller  
Christine Jerkowitz  
Joseph B. Levy  
Arthur D. Kirsch  
Sonya A. Quitslund  
Carol Smith  
Sheryl E. Spivack  
Philip W. Wirtz, Chair  
J. Frank Wright

*ex officio:*

Robert A. Chernak  
Roderick S. French  
J. Matthew Gaglione  
Anthony T.G. Pallett  
George W.G. Stoner

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Interdepartmental Memorandum

TO: Professor W.B Griffith, Chairman, Senate Executive Committee  
FROM: R.J. Harrington, Chairman, Senate Standing Committee - Libraries  
DATE: January 17, 1992  
RE: Interim Report of Senate Standing Committee on Libraries

RJH

During the current Faculty Senate year, the committee has met on the following three occasions:

- (i) October 31, 1991
- (ii) November 15, 1991
- (iii) January 17, 1992

The principal business of the committee this year has been

- (a) The developments within the Washington Research Library Consortium . A presentation of the committee's view of the intended withdrawal of Georgetown University from the consortium was made by the chairman of the committee at the Senate Faculty meeting on December 13, 1991. The rôle the committee would like GW to take within the consortium is being considered at its next meeting in February and it is expected that there will be a resolution forthcoming from the committee to the Senate at that time.
- and (b) The development of the Strategic Plan for the Gelman Library During the April committee meeting, further discussion of the Gelman Strategic Plan is proposed when the University Librarian has had the opportunity to provide the committee with the Plan for the next period.

The committee's amended Mission Statement was agreed upon and forwarded to the Executive Committee for concurrence and submission to Senate.

c:

D.D. Trone,  
file(2)

(Coordinator, Senate Activities)  
(d03/f152)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Interdepartmental Memorandum

TO: Professor W.B Griffith, Chairman, Senate Executive Committee  
FROM: R.J. Harrington, Chairman, Senate Standing Committee - Research  
DATE: January 17, 1992  
RE: Interim Report of Senate Standing Committee on Research

RyH

During the current Faculty Senate year, the committee has met on the following three occasions:

- (i) October 18, 1991
- (ii) November 15, 1991
- (iii) January 10, 1992

The principal business of the committee this year has been the report prepared by the previous year's Senate Committee on Research entitled "Research at GW: Constraints and Incentives". The committee felt strongly that the report was well produced and relevant and therefore should be presented to the Faculty Senate at the earliest opportunity.

Professor Garris, having been a member of the previous committee agreed to present the highlights of the report and to lead the discussion from the floor of the Senate on November 8, 1991.

Following President Trachtenberg's letter to the previous committee chairman, Professor Berman and remarks made at the November Senate meeting, the committee concentrated on further dialogue with the President on the essential points of the report.

Upon request of various committee members, financial data was provided to the committee by the Office of Sponsored Research to enable the committee to understand the level of agreed overhead charged to research grants. A meeting with the Internal Audit Director has been suggested as this continues to be a matter of concern to the committee as indeed does return of indirect costs to Schools, departments and Principal Investigators. Further recommendations regarding this and other matters highlighted in the "Research at GW:...." report will be forthcoming by the end of the Senate year.

The committee's Mission Statement is still under review and will be discussed at the next meeting for forwarding to the Senate Executive Committee.

c:  
D.D. Trone, (Coordinator, Senate Activities)  
file(2) (d03/f153)



January 14, 1992

TO: Professor William B. Griffith, Chair  
Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Dennis H. Holmes, Chair  
Committee on University and Urban Affairs

RE: Interim Report for 1991-1992 Academic Year

The Committee on University and Urban Affairs (Committee) has focused its efforts on promoting opportunities for faculty involvement in the affairs of the Community. In addition, the Committee seeks to gain a better understanding of the factors that appear to facilitate or inhibit faculty involvement, some of which are internal, such as whether such involvement is taken into account in promotion and tenure decisions, and some of which are external, such as access and already existing linkages.

The Committee plans to hold two meetings with community leaders in March and April of this year. Participants in the March meeting will include the Mayor, the City Administrator, the Director of the Department of Human Services, the Commissioner of Health, plus several other heads of City agencies that deal with human services issues. In addition to the City leaders, we have invited leaders of several non-profit community agencies, including the Whitman-Walker Clinic and the Washington Urban League. Faculty members from the Medical School, SEHD, the National Law Center, the Departments of Sociology, Human Services, and Psychology, and representatives from Gelman library also will be invited to participate.

A second meeting is planned for April with leaders of community cultural organizations, including museums, performing arts groups, recreation and sports agencies in the City, plus other relevant cultural/arts organizations. Faculty from the fine arts, humanities, museum studies, and other appropriate academic units within the University will be invited to attend.

The main purpose of these meetings is to stimulate direct linkages between faculty and community leaders. In addition, we hope the discussions that take place during these meetings will lead to expanding our understanding of ways to extend faculty involvement in community affairs.

A full report of our findings and recommendations will be prepared for submission to the Executive Committee and the Senate by the close of the academic year.

## JOINT COMMITTEE OF FACULTY AND STUDENTS MID-YEAR REPORT, JAN. 1991

Regular meeting times for JCFS have been established for the fourth Friday of the month, September, October, November, January, February, March, April, at 9AM, in Lisner 603. Chairing and minute-taking is being rotated between the student and faculty co-chairs. The first three meetings took place as scheduled. The next meeting is set for Friday, Jan. 24; all are welcome to attend.

My overall impression from interacting with student leaders on this committee is that despite some areas of concern, students are generally satisfied with the state and the direction of the University and their educational experience here. To date we can report six matters on which progress has been made.

1. A Subcommittee to develop a mission statement for the JCFS has been formed and is composed of students Monica Risam and Charles Butler, and faculty members Max Ticktin and Pat Sullivan. A draft is expected at the January meeting.
2. The new Student Stipend Plan is being implemented. A seven-person committee chaired by Dean of Students Linda Donnels has been established to judge applications for the 7 \$1000 awards, called stipends, for students contributing extensively to campus life. The formal announcement will go out shortly; the deadline for applications is Friday, March 27.
3. A student honor code subcommittee has been established to report to the JCFS on issues regarding the possible adoption of a student honor code. The issues have been discussed at length and a presentation of a revised and more detailed draft from the Student Association is scheduled for the January 24 meeting.
4. Student concerns for the need to support and encourage Faculty-Student interaction on campus has been discussed at length in two meetings. Concrete proposals raised by students are being studied. For example, a program of free tickets for basketball games for faculty who accompany students is being developed by Committee member Chris Speron.
5. Concerns about graduate student feelings of disenfranchisement have been aired; Lou Reynolds, the administrator directly responsible for graduate student enrollment and support services, has reported to the JCFS in a fruitful exchange in the October meeting. The committee plans to develop formal suggestions following further inquiry.
6. Problems of student harassment have been discussed and a resolution passed (a copy of the resolution is available from Stephen Smith).

Official and ex officio members who have been active on the committee this year are: Max Ticktin, Pat Sullivan, Martha Pardavi, Laura Youens, Monica Risam, Charles Butler, Cheryl Beil, Susan Kaplan, Liz Panyon, Christopher Speron, Christopher Deering, Linda Donnels, John Benison, Matt Moog, Jason Schwartz, Raffi Terzian, David Parker, M. Pardour-Florvats, Molly Tatman, Maria Proestou and Stephen Smith (who prepared this report).

**ADMINISTRATIVE STANDING COMMITTEES**

February, 1992

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D. C.

TO: Members of the University Faculty Assembly

FROM: William B. Griffith, Chair *W B Griffith*  
Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

RE: Appointments to Administrative Standing and Special  
Committees for the Year 1992-93

At its April and May meetings the Faculty Senate will recommend faculty for presidential appointment to membership on certain Administrative Standing Committees listed below. When the Executive Committee meets in March, it will draw up a list of faculty nominees for approval by the Senate.

If you are interested in volunteering your services--and I urge you to give the matter serious consideration--please indicate your preferences and return this form to:

FACULTY SENATE OFFICE  
RICE HALL, #305

BY MARCH 11, 1992.

Committee on Campus Security  
Committee on the Judicial System  
Committee on Student Publications  
Committee on University Bookstore  
GW Forum  
Joint Committee of Faculty  
and Students

Marvin Center Governing Board  
Marvin Center Program Board  
Panel for Student Grievance  
Review Committees  
University Hearing Board

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_ Rank \_\_\_\_\_

Currently serving on the Administrative Committee on: \_\_\_\_\_

Do you wish to be re-elected to this Committee? \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

I should like to serve on an Administrative Committee according to my preferences below:

(1st Choice) \_\_\_\_\_

(2nd Choice) \_\_\_\_\_

(3rd Choice) \_\_\_\_\_

I will be available for committee work during the regular academic year \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

I will also be available for committee work during at least one of the summer sessions \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

I prefer not to serve during 1992-93 \_\_\_\_.

Thank you for your prompt consideration of this matter.

**FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES**

February, 1992

**THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**  
Washington, D. C.

**TO:** Members of the University Faculty Assembly

**FROM:** William B. Griffith, Chair *W B Griffith*  
Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

**RE:** Call for Nominations for Election to Faculty Senate  
Standing Committees, 1992-93 Session

In April, the newly-elected and incumbent Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will meet jointly "to nominate the members and chairmen of the standing committees and special committees" of the Faculty Senate for the year 1992-93.

I urge all colleagues seriously to consider volunteering their service to one of the following Senate Committees during the forthcoming year. It is likely that in the coming term several of the Standing Committees will be somewhat restructured as joint Faculty Senate/Administration Committees, but the details have not yet been worked out. If you wish to be elected or re-elected to a Senate Committee, please return this form to:

**FACULTY SENATE OFFICE**  
**RICE HALL, #305**

**BY MARCH 27, 1992.**

Administrative Matters as They  
Affect the Faculty  
Appointment, Salary, and Promotion  
Policies (including Fringe Benefits)  
Athletics  
Dispute Resolution Committee (3-year term)  
Educational and Admissions Policy  
Faculty Development and Support  
Fiscal Planning and Budgeting

Honors and Academic Convocations  
Libraries  
Physical Facilities  
Professional Ethics and Academic  
Freedom  
Research  
Student Financial Aid  
University and Urban Affairs

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_ Rank \_\_\_\_\_

Currently serving on the Senate Committee on: \_\_\_\_\_

Do you wish to be re-elected to this Committee? \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

I should like to serve on a Senate Committee according to my preferences below:

(1st Choice) \_\_\_\_\_

(2nd Choice) \_\_\_\_\_

(3rd Choice) \_\_\_\_\_

I will be available for committee  
work during the regular academic  
year \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

I will also be available for  
committee work during at least one  
of the summer sessions \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

I prefer not to serve during 1992-93 \_\_\_\_.



THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, DC

The Faculty Senate

January 6, 1992

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, January 17, 1992, at 2:10 p.m., in Lisner Hall 603.

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of December 13, 1991
3. Resolutions:  
  
A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE TO ESTABLISH SCHOOL-WIDE PERSONNEL COMMITTEES (91/6), with accompanying Report; Professor Hill, Chair, Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies (including Fringe Benefits) (Resolution 91/6 and Report are attached)
4. Introduction of Resolutions
5. General Business:
  - (a) Nomination for election of Chris Filstrup, Assistant University Librarian for Collections, to the Research Committee as a replacement for Debbie Masters
  - (b) Report of the Executive Committee: Professor William B. Griffith, Chair
  - (c) Interim Reports of Senate Committee Chairs
6. Brief Statements (and Questions)
7. Adjournment



J. Matthew Gaglione  
Secretary



A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE TO ESTABLISH SCHOOL-WIDE PERSONNEL COMMITTEES (91/6)

WHEREAS, all academic units of the University are required by the Faculty Code (Art. IV-B and C) to publish their criteria for the tenure and promotion of regular full-time faculty; and

WHEREAS, school-wide personnel committees have served to assure uniformity in the application of these criteria in those schools where such committees have been established; and

WHEREAS, all faculty have a professional interest in the maintenance of high and uniform standards for tenure and promotion throughout the University; NOW, THEREFORE  
BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

- (1) THAT a new Section D be added to Article IV of the Faculty Code to read:

"D. School-Wide Personnel Committees

To implement the procedures required in Sections B.3 and C.2 above, each school or college shall establish a school-wide personnel committee, either as an elected standing committee or of the school faculty acting as a committee of the whole, to consider recommendations for or against the reappointment, promotion, or tenure of regular full-time faculty. Such committees may request additional information, documentation, or clarification respecting such recommendations. Further:

1. a. An elected standing committee, sitting in review of recommendations originating from a department or equivalent unit, shall advise the dean of that school or college as to whether the candidate has met the relevant school and department criteria, and whether 'compelling reasons' exist for not following the faculty recommendation. Such advisories shall not be construed as 'faculty recommendations' as defined by Sec. B.3. of the Procedures for Implementation of the Faculty Code.

b. Such elected standing committees may also review departmental criteria for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, and, as deemed appropriate, recommend that such criteria be clarified or specified more fully.

2. When the faculty of a school or college, sitting as a committee of the whole, serves as the school's personnel committee, and initiates recommendations to the

(continued)

Resolution 91/6 (cont'd)

dean for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, such recommendations shall be construed as 'faculty recommendations' in the sense of Procedures, Sec. B.3."

- (2) THAT Section D. of Article IV, "Nondiscrimination," be restyled "E. Nondiscrimination."

Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies  
January 6, 1992

January 1992

To: Members, Faculty Senate

Fr: Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion  
Policies

Subj.: Committee Report on a Resolution to Establish School-wide  
Personnel Committees by Amending the Faculty Code

The Faculty Code, by requiring all schools and departments to publish specific criteria for promotion and tenure, expresses a university-wide commitment to high professional standards. Initially missing from this commitment were mechanisms designed to assure that standards would be uniformly applied. Since the adoption of criteria, several schools have met this need by establishing school-wide personnel committees whose function is to review departmental recommendations and to advise the dean as to whether both school and departmental criteria have been met. A positive recommendation means that a dean can forward his own recommendation with assurance that criteria have been fulfilled and that excellence and promise have been recognized.

We have been made aware, however, that problems may arise when a personnel committee finds against a department's recommendation for promotion or tenure. Hypothetically or in practice, the department may at this point withdraw its recommendation. Or it may, as the Code provides, lay its recommendation before the dean. The proposed amendment does not vitiate a dean's responsibility to act on a departmental recommendation. Here the Code is explicit: personnel actions "shall normally follow faculty recommendations. Departures from this standard shall be limited to those cases involving compelling reasons." Moreover, the Code plainly intends that deans and departments be the opposing parties in nonconcurrence cases. The Code amendment we propose adheres to that intention. Personnel committees are not to be parties to nonconcurrences. Deans must still find "compelling reasons" for rejecting a departmental recommendation. Although a personnel committee may discover such reasons, and a dean may act on them, the committee's negative advisory cannot be in itself a "compelling reason" for a dean's rejection of a departmental recommendation. To assure that the dean's action alone be the basis for nonconcurrence proceedings, the proposed amendment expressly states that personnel committee "advisories shall not be construed as 'faculty recommendations' as defined by Section B of Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code." The exception to this construction would lie with schools in which a committee of the whole makes the recommendations for promotion or tenure. Such recommendations clearly constitute a

faculty recommendation within the meaning of Section B of the Code "Procedures."

Deans who are advised by personnel committees inform us that they welcome the advice of these committees in assuring that high and uniform standards are applied. Some faculty, however, have expressed doubts. Our report addresses those doubts in the context of the proposed amendment.

#### The Case for Uniformity

The Code requires all academic units, schools as well as departments, to "publish" their criteria for promotion and tenure. Departmental criteria tell what the faculty expects of their junior colleagues in terms of excellence and creativity peculiar to the discipline. School criteria tend to be more general in nature, although certain categories of accomplishment (in scholarship, teaching, and service) mirror the expectations of the departments. Where personnel committees exist, the school faculty has delegated responsibility to a representative body to assure that candidates have fulfilled both school and departmental criteria, and that the procedures stipulated by school and departmental bylaws have been followed.

Deans on whom the faculty rely to uphold the high standards they profess testify to the importance of having personnel (or APT) committees to monitor the judgment of departments. Dean Kenny writes: "Their ability to reach informed and independent conclusions acts as a check on the common instinct within a department for faculty members to support each other (or less often, to adopt a tacit 'pull up the gangplank' attitude to keep their own ranks from being enlarged)." Similarly, Dean Keimowitz writes: "I believe that in departments, perhaps particularly smaller ones, collegial relationships develop that can easily and understandably color important decisions. . . . Our AP&T Committee has traditionally considered its primary role to be the review of criteria for promotion, and has regularly rejected departmental recommendations if they feel the faculty member in question is not yet ready." From a somewhat different perspective, Dean East writes of the ESIA personnel committee that "it is also necessary as a check on those faculty who may, for a portion of their careers, choose to devote more time to School tasks at the expense of department responsibilities. In at least one case, the School personnel committee differed with the department recommendation. The School committee recommendation was followed."

#### Answering the Critics:

One critic of existing personnel committees writes: "The committees often demonstrate insensitivity to the needs and the resources of individual departments, and tend blindly to apply criteria characteristic of the committee members. . . . There are

departments which require expertise where creativity is more important than traditional scholarship, and there are departments who specialize in training, clinical work, and off-campus activities." Dean Kenny (CCAS and GSAS) takes an opposing view. He writes: "It is frequently objected that qualifications can best be judged by colleagues in the same discipline--a political scientist, for example, will have no basis for evaluating the qualifications of a physicist. The evidence of well over a decade in GSAS and nearly a decade in CCAS suggests otherwise: faculty members can inform themselves adequately to recognize work of high quality in whatever field. They are, of course, assisted by the materials presented to them, especially evaluations from non-university professional sources." Similarly, Dean Keimowitz writes: "There is little question that a small interdisciplinary committee does not always have the expertise to evaluate the scientific merit of some faculty members' credentials. This minor problem is controlled by carefully gathering and reviewing information from external reviewers. Furthermore, the broad interdisciplinary view of senior faculty has been most beneficial in raising the standards that we apply to these critical decisions."

Another criticism of existing personnel committees is that they may become over-zealous and inquire too minutely into the bases of a departmental recommendation. Be that as it may, we believe that the proposed Code amendment defines the reasonable extent of inquiry and, by that definition, the limits of inquiry. That is, a personnel committee can reasonably be expected to ask for more information, for more documented evidence of high quality, or for clarification of the standards and procedures that have preceded its review. If a department believes the committee to have been unreasonable, it may take its recommendation directly to the dean who, in turn, must find "compelling reasons" to reject it. Having a school-wide personnel committee admittedly involves more give and take. As Dean Kenny writes, "I have viewed the process as a ladder of review, each step of which, from department to Personnel Committee to Dean to Vice President, needs to be negotiated before action can be taken."

The argument is also heard that schools should have "local option," either to establish a personnel committee or to leave departmental recommendations to the judgment of the dean. The force of this argument lies in the Code's ultimate juxtaposing of dean and department as the sole parties to nonconcurrence cases. Only the dean (or Vice President) has the authority to reject a departmental recommendation, and only for compelling reasons. Why not, then, let the dean alone find the compelling reasons lest there be (as one critic puts it) "a loss of collegiality when one group of faculty stands off against another?"

As a counter-argument, personnel committees not only act as a check on departments; they also act as a potential check on deans--deans who may be perceived to be (however unlikely) overworked, indifferent, hostile, prone to play favorites, etc.,



etc. Moreover, it is, or should be, an article of faculty faith that deans generally make better decisions when they have faculty advice. The principal argument against "local option," however, is that faculty and deans alike share a common interest in maintaining high and uniform standards for promotion and tenure. In schools that have personnel committees, we have assurance that those standards are being met. Again, to quote Dean Kenny. " "...without at all disparaging the senior faculty. I believe it is true that the level of accomplishment of faculty promoted in recent years exceeds that of those promoted before the [CCAS and GSAS] Committees existed." And from Dean Keimowitz: "Our senior and small interdisciplinary AP&T committee has been pivotal in formulating the policies by which faculty should be considered for promotion and tenure, and also in acting as the institutional barometer to ensure the rigorous and fair application of these principles."

Finally, convinced that all faculty have a professional stake in the quality of all schools, we urge the adoption of the amendment.